



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Francois Van Zanten

Title: **DIFFERENTIAL AMPLIFIER WITH A COMMON MODE VOLTAGE LOOP**

Serial No.: 10/826,467

Filing Date: April 16, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: 2269-17-3

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 15th day of November, 2005 by

  
Signature

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

November 15, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This communication is in response to the Restriction Requirement dated September 15, 2005 in which the Examiner restricted the pending claims in the present patent application.

The Examiner has restricted the claims into three groups: Claims directed to Figure 2 (Group I), claims directed to Figure 3 (Group II), and claims directed to Figure 4 (Group III). As discussed below, the Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Examiner can search and examine the entire application without serious burden. Although the Applicants traverse the restriction requirement as discussed below, they provisionally elect to prosecute Group I claims 1-4 and 11-26 if the Examiner does not withdraw the restriction requirement.

According to MPEP § 803, if the Examiner can search and examine the application without serious burden, then he/she **MUST** examine the application on the merits even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. As discussed below, because claims 1 – 26 recite similar subject matter, the Examiner can perform a single search and examination that will cover all of the claims. Consequently, the Examiner can search and examine the application without serious burden, and, therefore, **MUST** examine all of the claims 1 – 26 together.

Furthermore, because these claims recite related subject matter, examination of these claims will involve similar analyses. Therefore, it is only slightly more burdensome for the Examiner to search and examine claims 1 – 26 than it would be for him/her to search and examine the provisionally elected Group I claims 1 – 4 and 11 – 26. Consequently, because there is no serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the claims 1 – 26, the **restriction is improper**. Therefore, the Examiner **MUST** withdraw the restriction and examine all of the claims.

Therefore, as discussed above, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the restriction requirement and to examine all of the claims 1 - 26.

Also enclosed is a Certified Copy of the Priority Document.

In the event an additional fee is due for this Response, you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 07-1897. If the Examiner believes that a phone interview would be helpful, he is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants' attorney, Paul F. Rusyn, at (425) 455-5575.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

Paul F. Rusyn  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,118  
155 - 108th Avenue NE, Suite. 350  
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973  
(425) 455-5575

Enclosures:

Request for Extension of Time  
Certified Copy of Priority Document  
Check # 24939 for fees  
Return Postcard